

MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 25, 1929.

The ninth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1929 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, April 25, 1929.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,

Mr. Garfield,

Mr. Morris,

Mr. Vitale,

Mr. Winter,

also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and

Executive Officer. There were also present Mr. Arthur F. Brinckerhoff, Landscape Architect, of New York City, and Mr. William B. Parsons, Architect, of Chicago.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting held March 21, 1929, were approved.

2. PLANS FOR PROPOSED BUILDINGS ON THE NORTH SIDE OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE: Mr. Alfred Granger, Architect of Chicago, appeared before the Commission, in company with Mr. Charles W. Eliot II, City Planner of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, with plans proposed for the treatment of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, from the Capitol to the Treasury Department. Mr. Granger said the plans had been prepared voluntarily by the Chicago Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and were offered to the Commission of Fine Arts for criticism and suggestion, they

having met with favor by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as a general scheme. The plans (photostat copies of which were presented)

MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 25, 1929.

The ninth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1929 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, April 25, 1929.

The following members were present:

- Mr. Moore, Chairman,
- Mr. Garfield,
- Mr. Morris,
- Mr. Vitale,
- Mr. Winter,
- also Mr. H. P. Cassemeyer, Secretary and

Executive Officer. There were also present Mr. Arthur F. Brinckerhoff, Landscape Architect, of New York City, and Mr. William B. Parsons, Architect, of Chicago.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting held March 21, 1929, were approved.

2. PLANS FOR PROPOSED BUILDINGS ON THE NORTH SIDE OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE: Mr. Alfred Granger, Architect of Chicago, appeared before the Commission in company with Mr. Charles W. Elliot II, City Planner of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, with plans proposed for the treatment of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, from the Capitol to the Treasury Department. Mr. Granger said the plans had been prepared voluntarily by the Chicago Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and were offered to the Commission of Fine Arts for criticism and suggestion, they having met with favor by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as a general scheme. The plans (photostat copies of which were presented)

were designed on a roll of drawings 30' in length; there was also a tracing of a ground plan submitted.

Mr. Granger said that the designs of the buildings were made to be in keeping with those on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue, which are being erected by the Federal Government. They will be higher than the Government buildings, but the belt course and cornice lines (a zoning height of 90 feet) on each will be about the same. There are five buildings, he said, that have been incorporated in the plan, namely: the Washington Hotel, Willard Hotel, Munsey Building, National Theater, and the Star Building. By the adoption of the plan individual owners would not be expected to adopt literally the type of building as proposed, but it would serve as notice to a building as to the general type of building he would be expected to build, and in this respect, Mr. Granger said, the question of material should also be considered by the Commission of Fine Arts. The matter was being brought before the Commission particularly at this time because of the fact that the Shipstead-Luce Bill (H.R. 8746, Exhibit A), which passed the House of Representatives during the closing days of the 70th Congress, February 25, 1929, will doubtless be reintroduced at the next regular session of Congress, and many believe will be adopted during the winter months. This Bill is to provide for regulation of the height and exterior design and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital. It is not to be retroactive, but is to apply to new buildings, or alteration of existing buildings.

The Commission inspected the designs, block by block. It was noted that the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue would not exhibit a continuous row of buildings, as on the south side, because of breaks in the streets,

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission, who studied out the

were designed on a roll of drawings 30' in length; there was also a tracing

of a ground plan submitted.

Mr. Granger said that the designs of the buildings were made to be

in keeping with those on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue, which are

being erected by the Federal Government. They will be higher than the

Government buildings, but the belt course and cornice lines (a zoning

height of 90 feet) on each will be about the same. There are five buildings,

he said, that have been incorporated in the plan, namely: the Washington Hotel,

Willard Hotel, Munsey Building, National Theater, and the Star Building. By

the adoption of the plan individual owners would not be expected to adopt

literally the type of building as proposed, but it would serve as notice to

a building as to the general type of building he would be expected to

build, and in this respect, Mr. Granger said, the question of material

should also be considered by the Commission of Fine Arts. The matter was

being brought before the Commission particularly at this time because of

the fact that the Shipstead-Ince Bill (H.R. 8746, Exhibit A), which passed

the House of Representatives during the closing days of the 70th Congress,

February 25, 1929, will doubtless be reintroduced at the next regular session

of Congress, and many believe will be adopted during the winter months. This

Bill is to provide for regulation of the height and exterior design and

construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the

National Capital. It is not to be retroactive, but is to apply to new

buildings, or alteration of existing buildings.

The Commission inspected the designs, block by block. It was noted

that the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue would not exhibit a continuous

row of buildings, as on the south side, because of breaks in the streets,

offsets and triangles, and that this would allow some leeway in the treatment of the buildings. The Bus Terminal proposed at about Seventh Street was noted on the plan. Mr. Moore said he did not think that a proper place for the Terminal as it would cause congestion of traffic in that locality and would interfere with the general scheme of buildings. The Commission concurred in this, and it was suggested that this matter of location of the Bus Terminal be given further study. Mr. Moore said the square between D and E and 7th and 8th Streets would be appropriate; it would be near to the Triangle, and therefore convenient to employees, although not fronting it.

At the east end of the Avenue the scheme of buildings would be properly related to the Municipal Center and the proposed buildings near the Capitol, including the plan for the Enlargement of the Capitol Grounds and developing Union Station Plaza, and the connection with the new Avenue from Second St. and Pennsylvania Avenue direct to the Union Station.

On the whole, the Commission regarded the scheme of buildings for the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue an interesting design for future study.

(The plan was exhibited with the model for the Triangle at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in their respective places on the north and south side of Pennsylvania Avenue).

3. HOWARD UNIVERSITY, buildings and grounds. Plans for a Women's Dormitory, in connection with a building scheme and landscape plan for Howard University grounds were submitted by Dr. Mordecai Johnson, President, and Dr. Emmett J. Scott, Secretary-Treasurer, of Howard University. Mr. Albert I. Cassell, architect of the University, explained the plans.

Mr. Cassell said that pursuant to the suggestion of Mr. Caemmerer he had gone to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, who studied out the

offsets and triangles, and that this would allow some leeway in the treatment of the buildings. The Bus Terminal proposed at about Seventh Street was noted on the plan. Mr. Moore said he did not think that a proper place for the Terminal as it would cause congestion of traffic in that locality and would interfere with the general scheme of buildings. The Commission concurred in this, and it was suggested that this matter of location of the Bus Terminal be given further study. Mr. Moore said the square between D and E and 5th and 6th Streets would be appropriate; it would be near to the Triangle, and therefore convenient to employees, although not fronting it. At the east end of the Avenue the scheme of buildings would be properly related to the Municipal Center and the proposed buildings near the Capitol, including the plan for the enlargement of the Capitol Grounds and developing Union Station Plaza, and the connection with the new Avenue from Second St. and Pennsylvania Avenue direct to the Union Station. On the whole, the Commission regarded the scheme of buildings for the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue as interesting design for future study. (The plan was exhibited with the model for the Triangle at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in their respective places on the north and south side of Pennsylvania Avenue). HOWARD UNIVERSITY, buildings and grounds. Plans for a Women's Dormitory, in connection with a building scheme and landscape plan for Howard University grounds were submitted by Dr. Mordacai Johnson, President, and Dr. Emmett J. Scott, Secretary-Treasurer, of Howard University. Mr. Albert L. Cassell, architect of the University, explained the plans. Mr. Cassell said that pursuant to the suggestion of Mr. Gammeter he had gone to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, who studied out the

plan of relating Howard University to the Highway Plan of the District of Columbia, in relation also to future recreation grounds in the locality contemplated by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. These were indicated on the general landscape plan of the grounds submitted, which showed also the location of proposed new buildings. As for a Circle or Square at Vermont Avenue (extended) and Georgia Avenue, this the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has found impossible because of obstructions of existing buildings which prevent the extension of the Avenue directly to Georgia Avenue, and plans for recreation grounds in the vicinity. The main entrance to the University will be Howard Place

Mr. Cassell said the University authorities had suggested placing the National Negro Memorial of the World War, recently authorized by Congress, on the west side of Georgia Avenue, between Euclid and Fairmount Streets, on grounds extending west to Ninth Street.

The plan of buildings called for a 25 year program. Dr. Scott said the grounds of Howard University comprise 20 acres; there are from 12 to 15 buildings there and about 2500 students.

The landscape plan was inspected, and in general approved by the Commission.

Mr. Cassell thereupon explained the plans for the proposed Women's Dormitory. There will be five buildings, each five stories high (four stories and ground floor) of brick, and will accommodate 556 students. Congress has made an appropriation of \$190,000 available for beginning the first unit. The main building will have a length of 368 feet.

Mr. Garfield, Mr. Morris and Mr. Parsons inspected the architectural features of the buildings and had no particular criticisms to make concerning

plan of relating Howard University to the Highway Plan of the District of Columbia, in relation also to future recreation grounds in the locality contemplated by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. These were indicated on the general landscape plan of the grounds submitted, which showed also the location of proposed new buildings. As for a Circle or Square at Vermont Avenue (extended) and Georgia Avenue, this the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has found impossible because of obstructions of existing buildings which prevent the extension of the Avenue directly to Georgia Avenue, and plans for recreation grounds in the vicinity. The main entrance to the University will be Howard Place.

Mr. Cassell said the University authorities had suggested placing the National Negro Memorial of the World War, recently authorized by Congress, on the west side of Georgia Avenue, between Euclid and Fairmount Streets, on grounds extending west to Ninth Street.

The plan of buildings called for a 25 year program. Dr. Scott said the grounds of Howard University comprise 20 acres; there are from 12 to 15 buildings there and about 2500 students.

The landscape plan was inspected, and in general approved by the Commission.

Mr. Cassell thereupon explained the plans for the proposed Women's Dormitory. There will be five buildings, each five stories high (four stories and ground floor) of brick, and will accommodate 568 students. Congress has made an appropriation of \$190,000 available for beginning the first unit. The main building will have a length of 368 feet.

Mr. Garfield, Mr. Morris and Mr. Persons inspected the architectural features of the buildings and had no particular criticisms to make concerning

them, excepting the treatment of the parapet at the roof end of the building (recalling the old State House at Boston). Mr. Cassell was advised that this could be retained with a gambrel roof, which would give more space for rooms underneath. It was regarded an interesting design but one that could be simplified. Mr. Cassell was complimented on the interesting set of drawings prepared by him.

The plans for the Dormitory were approved, with the suggestions made to the architect (Exhibit B).

4. GEORGE ROGERS CLARK MEMORIAL: Mr. Wm. E. Parsons, Architectural Adviser, of the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, presented plans prepared by his firm, Bennett, Parsons and Frost, 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, for the general lay-out of the George Rogers Clark Memorial, to be erected at Vincennes, Indiana, at the site of old Fort Sackville, captured by George Rogers Clark in 1779, and commemorating the winning of the northwest by him and his men. The sum of \$1,000,000 has been authorized for this Memorial by Congress, and under the terms of the Act, "the plans and designs of the said memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts" (Exhibit C).

Mr. Parsons said twelve acres have been given by the State of Indiana for this Memorial. He exhibited a ground plan showing the layout proposed in relation to the City of Vincennes and adjacent to the Wabash River, with a Memorial Building at the site of old Fort Sackville as the central feature. The lay-out has an L shaped plan. Mr. Parsons also submitted a more detailed ground plan of the Memorial Scheme itself, saying that in connection with the Memorial Building it was proposed to have certain statues, to commemorate priest, citizen and soldier, who were particularly

them, excepting the treatment of the parapet at the roof end of the building (recalling the old State House at Boston). Mr. Cassell was advised that this could be retained with a gambrel roof, which would give more space for rooms underneath. It was regarded an interesting design but one that could be simplified. Mr. Cassell was complimented on the interesting set of drawings prepared by him.

The plans for the Dormitory were approved, with the suggestions made to the architect (Exhibit B).

4. GEORGE ROGERS CLARK MEMORIAL: Mr. Wm. H. Parsons, Architectural Adviser, of the George Rogers Clark Bicentennial Commission, presented plans prepared by his firm, Bennett, Parsons and Frost, 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, for the general lay-out of the George Rogers Clark Memorial, to be erected at Vincennes, Indiana, at the site of old Fort Sackville, captured by George Rogers Clark in 1779, and commemorating the winning of the northwest by him and his men. The sum of \$1,000,000 has been authorized for this Memorial by Congress, and under the terms of the Act, "the plans and designs of the said memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts" (Exhibit C).

Mr. Parsons said twelve acres have been given by the State of Indiana for this Memorial. He exhibited a ground plan showing the layout proposed in relation to the City of Vincennes and adjacent to the Wabash River, with a Memorial Building at the site of old Fort Sackville as the central feature. The lay-out has an H shaped plan. Mr. Parsons also submitted a more detailed ground plan of the Memorial Scheme itself, saying that in connection with the Memorial Building it was proposed to have certain statues, to commemorate priest, citizen and soldier, who were particularly

represented in the campaign,--the priest had a great deal to do in establishing friendly relations with the Indians. The plan showed the Cathedral in the locality, which, Mr. Parsons said, is a fine interesting old structure.

Another feature of the Memorial scheme would be a bridge to cross the Wabash River, with sculptured pylons at the bridge head. The bridge, Mr. Parsons said, was first designed as an ordinary railroad structure, but now there would be concrete arches--the river is 500 to 600 feet wide there.

The Commission called attention to the great opportunity to have mural decorations in the Memorial Building to represent historical scenes commemorative of the period. Mr. Parsons stated that it was the desire of the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission to have a pictorial representation of the leading historical scenes in color. The matter was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Winter, who said he felt good artists could be found for the work.

A suggested program of competition is to be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Moore said a few days ago he had been called before the Joint Committee on the Library at the United States Senate, Senator Fess, Chairman, and had considered the plans with the Committee, who asked questions concerning them and had thereupon endorsed the plans.

The Commission, after careful inspection of the drawings, expressed their appreciation of the plans for this Memorial and approved them.

(Exhibit D)

See also D-1

represented in the campaign.--the project had a great deal to do in establishing friendly relations with the Indians. The plan showed the Cathedral in the locality, which, Mr. Parsons said, is a fine interesting old structure.

Another feature of the memorial scheme would be a bridge across the Colorado River, with a suspended system at the bridge head. The bridge, Mr. Parsons said, was first designed as an ordinary railroad structure, but now there would be concrete towers--the river is 200 to 300 feet wide there.

The Commission called attention to the great opportunity to have mural decorations in the Memorial building to represent historical scenes commemorative of the period. Mr. Parsons stated that it was the desire of the George Rogers Clark Memorial Commission to have a pictorial representation of the leading historical scenes in color. The matter was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Winter, who said he felt good artists could be found for the work.

A suggested program of competition is to be submitted to the Commission at some date.

Mr. Moore said a few days ago he had been called before the Joint Committee on the Library at the United States Senate, Senator Jones, Chairman, and had considered the plans with the Committee, who asked questions concerning them and had thereupon endorsed the plans. The Commission, after careful inspection of the drawings, expressed their appreciation of the plans for this Memorial and approved them.

(Exhibit D)

See also D-1

5. "ROADWAY PLAN", ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY: Colonel Charles G. Mortimer, Quartermaster Supply Officer, War Department, appeared before the Commission with a plan prepared by the Quartermaster General's Office for the proposed treatment of the roads at the Arlington National Cemetery, particularly to relate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the Arlington Mansion with the Arlington Memorial Bridge. The Commission had inspected the plan at the meeting on March 21st, and in the meantime it had been given particular attention by Mr. Vitale, who strongly advised placing it in the care of a competent landscape architect for special study.

Mr. Moore said the plan was also considered at a meeting of the Committee on the Restoration of the Arlington Mansion a few days ago (which was also attended by Col. Mortimer), and during which the plan of roadways for Arlington was discussed.

Mr. Vitale said the architect of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Mr. Lorimer Rich, had hoped authority could be given to have a landscape plan prepared for the Tomb, according to the accepted plan prepared by Mr. Rich and Mr. Thomas H. Jones, Sculptor, as authorized by Congress, as follows (War Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1930, Public No. 843, 70th Congress, approved February 28, 1929, page 33:

"Tomb of the Unknown Soldier: For every expenditure requisite for or incident to the payment of the cost of the accepted design, including all working drawings and supervision of erection, and cost of the memorial, for completing the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Arlington National Cemetery, as authorized by the public resolution approved July 3, 1926 (44 Stat., pp. 914-915), \$47,500, to remain available until expended: Provided, That in carrying into effect the provisions of said public resolution the Secretary of War is authorized to do all the things necessary to accomplish this purpose, by contract, with ~~xxx~~ or without advertising, under such conditions as he may prescribe, including the engagement, by contract, of services of such architect, sculptors, artists, or firms or partnerships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as he may deem necessary without regard to civil-service requirements and

6. "PROPOSED PLAN, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, D. C."
The Commission with a plan prepared by the Quartermaster General's Office
for the proposed treatment of the tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the Arlington
National Cemetery. The Commission had indicated the plan as the meeting of March 1933, and in the meantime it had been
given particular attention by Mr. Vicks, who strongly advised against it
in the case of a competent landscape architect for special study.
Mr. Moore said the plan was also considered at a meeting of the
Committee on the Restoration of the Arlington National Cemetery a few days ago
(which was also attended by Col. Hartman), and during which the plan of
roadways for Arlington was discussed.
Mr. Vicks said the architect of the tomb of the Unknown Soldier,
Mr. Ernest Rich, had hoped authority could be given to have a landscape
plan prepared for the tomb, according to the accepted plan prepared by
Mr. Rich and Mr. Thomas H. Jones, Sculptor, as authorized by Congress,
as follows (War Department Appropriation Act, Fiscal Year 1930, Public Law 663,
70th Congress, approved February 28, 1929, page 33:

"Tomb of the Unknown Soldier: For every expenditure required
for or incident to the payment of the cost of the accepted design,
including all working drawings and supervision of erection, and cost
of the material, for completing the tomb of the Unknown Soldier
in the Arlington National Cemetery, as authorized by the public
resolution approved July 3, 1925 (44 Stat., p. 214-215), \$47,500,
to remain available until expended; provided, That in carrying into
effect the provisions of said public resolution the Secretary of War
is authorized to do all the things necessary to accomplish this
purpose, by contract, with him or without advertising, under such
conditions as he may prescribe, including the expenditure, by contract,
of services of such architect, sculptor, artist, or firm or person-
ships thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as he
may deem necessary without regard to civil-service requirements and

restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States, and when an appropriation shall have been made therefor, there may be constructed, in accordance with detailed plans and estimates to be prepared under the direction of the Secretary of War, approaches and surroundings, approximately four hundred and eighty feet by two hundred and twenty feet, together with the necessary adjacent roadways, to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, in the Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, all to be in harmony with the design for the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier accepted by the Secretary of War and approved by the Arlington Cemetery Commission, the American Battle Monuments Commission, and the Fine Arts Commission."

(At the meeting on the Federal Building Program, held at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, on the evening of April 26, 1929, at which Mr. Moore presided, Honorable Louis C. Cramton, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, gave as the estimated cost of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, according to the accepted plan mentioned above, as \$400,000).

On the whole the Commission regarded the layout of roadways proposed for the Arlington National Cemetery a very important project, and one which ought to be given special study by a landscape architect who would put into the plan high professional skill. The Commission decided to place the matter in the hands of Mr. Vitale for further consideration; and to recommend to the War Department that Mr. Arthur F. Brinckerhoff, Landscape Architect, be appointed to prepare a comprehensive plan for the Arlington National Cemetery, after careful study on the grounds (Exhibit Band E-1)

The Commission called attention to the plan for Greater Arlington, prepared with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, and approved by the Secretary of War November 6, 1925 (Drawing No. 6608-146, July, 1924), which contemplates including the Arlington Farms and the extension of the Arlington National Cemetery to the Potomac River, and thus relating it also to the park system of the District of Columbia, between the Lincoln Memorial and the Virginia side of the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

restrictions of law governing the employment and compensation of employees of the United States, and when an appropriation bill have been made therefor, there may be considered, in accordance with detailed plans and estimates to be prepared under the direction of the Secretary of War, approximately four hundred and eighty feet by two hundred and twenty feet, together with the necessary adjacent roadway, to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, in the Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, all to be in harmony with the design for the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier accepted by the Secretary of War and approved by the Arlington Cemetery Commission, the National Battle Monuments Commission, and the War Commission.

(At the meeting on the Federal Building Program, held at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, on the evening of April 23, 1925, at which Mr. Moore presided, Honorable Louis G. Crandon, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, gave as the estimated cost of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, according to the accepted plan mentioned above, as \$400,000.)

On the whole the Commission regarded the report of roadways proposed for the Arlington National Cemetery a very important project, and one which ought to be given special study by a landscape architect who could put into the plan high professional skill. The Commission decided to place the matter in the hands of Mr. Tilden for further consideration; and to recommend to the War Department that Mr. Arthur T. Bland, formerly landscape architect, be appointed to prepare a comprehensive plan for the Arlington National Cemetery, after careful study on the grounds (Exhibit 1544 H-1). The Commission called attention to the plan for Greater Arlington, prepared with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, and approved by the Secretary of War November 6, 1923 (Drawing No. 6800-146, July, 1922), which contemplated including the Arlington Park and the extension of the Arlington National Cemetery to the Potomac River, and this relation is also to the park system of the District of Columbia, between the Lincoln Memorial and the Virginia side of the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

6. GRAND TERRACE, MERIDIAN HILL PARK: Mr. H. W. Peaslee, architect, appeared before the Commission to consider the question of the Grand Terrace, particularly with reference to the west end, which was under consideration by the Commission at the meeting on March 21st. Mr. Peaslee said he understood the plan had been approved.

Mr. Vitale said that the plans for Meridian Hill Park have been presented again and again and have been approved, and that continued changes in them means extra expense to Mr. Peaslee in time and money. Mr. Moore replied that he felt the Commission was saving money every time Mr. Peaslee presented them, although there is no intention to make any radical changes in them. The question that has arisen in connection with the west end of the Grand Terrace involved the substitution of a retaining wall with a niche for a proposed fountain instead of an entrance to the park at this point; the Commission at the time of an inspection of Meridian Hill Park, on the afternoon of March 21st, raised the question as to how far this retaining wall would project towards Sixteenth Street, and what the character of the niche would be. Mr. Peaslee replied that so far as the projection is concerned it is sufficient merely for the planting at the west end of the Grand Terrace; that he had prepared no special design for the Sixteenth Street side of the Grand Terrace, but proposed simply a plain wall with allowance for a niche at some future time. This was agreeable to the Commission and to Major Mehaffey, Assistant Director of the Office of Public Building and Public Parks, who was present.

7. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Mr. Kendall submitted a plan dated April 18, 1929, for treatment of roadways at the Virginia end of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, on Columbia Island, with a copy of a letter

6. GRAND TERRACE, WASHINGTON WILL PARK: Mr. F. W. Haskins, architect, appeared before the Commission to consider the location of the Grand Terrace, particularly with reference to the west end, which was under consideration by the Commission at the meeting on March 1st. Mr. Haskins said he understood the plan had been approved.

Mr. Vicks said that the plans for the Washington Will Park have been presented again and again and have been approved, and that the Commission in their former action expressed to Mr. Haskins in June and August, Mr. Moore replied that he felt the Commission was saving money every time Mr. Haskins presented them, although there is no intention to make any radical changes in them. The question that has arisen in connection with the west end of the Grand Terrace involved the substitution of a retaining wall with a niche for a proposed fountain instead of an entrance to the park at this point; the Commission at the time of an inspection of Washington Will Park, on the afternoon of March 1st, raised the question as to how the hole remaining well would project towards the fountain, and what the character of the niche would be. Mr. Haskins replied that as far as the projection is concerned it is sufficient merely for the planting of the west end of the Grand Terrace; that he had prepared an aerial design for the fountain which side of the Grand Terrace, but proposed simply a plain wall with a niche for a niche at some future time. This was agreed to by the Commission and to Major Haskins, Assistant Director of the Office of Public Building and Public Parks, who was present.

7. AIRLIFT TO WASHINGTON BUILDING: Mr. Haskins submitted a plan dated April 18, 1925, for treatment of the building at the Treasury end of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, on Columbia Island, with a copy of letter

addressed to Major Mehaffey, Executive Assistant of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, dated April 16, 1929, as follows:

"I thank you for your letter of April 15th. I am glad that no subject is to be discussed that will make it necessary for me to be present, inasmuch as I have an important engagement for that day. Nevertheless there are several points that I should like to mention that might be considered. The first point is about the shape of Columbia Island, to which our Mr. Adams referred in his telephone of this forenoon. We imagine that as you have not said anything to the contrary, the print that we received showing the position of the Lee Highway, in relation to Columbia Island, gives the present shape of the Island. That, of course, does not follow out any drawing that we ever made. It is not necessary, in my opinion, for the Island on the boundary channel side to be executed as shown in our first drawings thereof, but as at present shaped it comes too near the circle south of the main plaza. We send herewith a print of the modification that we should desire; on this print the dotted line represents the western shore of the Island, as per the blue-print received. What we have done is to make a slight change as possible from the blueprint, but to increase the distance between the circle and the boundary channel.

The second point I should like to raise is the old question of two roads so close together as the Alexandria Traffic Road and the Park Drive. I remember objection was made at one time to having the traffic road where we put it next to the boundary channel as disturbing to those using the Park. Would it not be even more disturbing to change it to its proposed position immediately adjoining the Cemetery? Not only for appearance but for pecuniary considerations it would seem to me that one road west of the boundary channel was enough.

We have shown the main roads, paths and minor bridges which we should recommend for Columbia Island. One point which we should ask your advice about is the width of the channel between Columbia Island and Anacostan Island. Is it sufficiently wide for tidal flow? In general our idea about the general appearance of Columbia Island is that it should be, as regards its planting, as nearly like Anacostan Island as possible, ~~and~~ save that on the main arteries there would be formally planted trees."

The Commission inspected the plan. Major Mehaffey, who was present, said the National Capital Park and Planning Commission have no objection to this plan, although they would eliminate certain features of it, which might be considered matters of detail. Attention was called to the cross-arms. The omission of the temples indicated at the ellipses at the ends of the

addressed to Major Hatcher, Executive Assistant of the National Capital Bridge Commission, dated April 10, 1953, as follows:

"I thank you for your letter of April 10, 1953. I am glad that the subject is to be discussed and will make it necessary for me to be present, inasmuch as I have an important engagement for that day. Nevertheless there are several points that I should like to mention that might be considered. The first point is about the shape of Columbia Island, to which our Mr. Adams referred in his telephone call of this forenoon. We had the same as you have not said anything to the contrary, the point that we received showing the location of the highway, in relation to Columbia Island, shows the present shape of the island. That, of course, does not follow any drawing that we ever made. It is not necessary, in my opinion, for the island on the boundary channel side to be expanded as shown in our first drawing. But as at present it is some 100 feet from the side of the main island. The second point is a point of the location of the highway, we should consider; on this point the dotted line represents the present shape of the island, as per the latest receiving. What we have done is to make a slight change as possible from the blueprint, but to increase the distance between the island and the boundary channel.

The second point I should like to raise is the old question of two roads as shown on the blueprint. I remember objection was made at one time to having the Park Drive. I remember objection was made at one time to having the traffic road where we put it next to the boundary channel as disturbing to those using the Park Drive. Would it not be even more disturbing to change it to the proposed location immediately adjoining the highway? Not only for appearance but for proximity considerations it would seem to be that one road west of the boundary channel was enough.

We have shown the main roads, public and minor highways which we should recommend for Columbia Island. The point which we would like to raise about is the width of the channel between Columbia Island and Anacostan Island. Is it sufficiently wide for tidal flow? In general our idea about the general appearance of Columbia Island is that it should be, as regards the plan, as nearly like Anacostan Island as possible, and have trees on the main terrace there would be formally planted trees."

The Commission inspected the plan, Major Hatcher, who was present,

said the National Capital Bridge Commission has no objection to

this plan, although they would eliminate certain features of it, which

might be considered matters of detail. Attention was called to the cross-section

The location of the bridge indicated at the right of the plan of the

Please approve

cross arms was recommended, and this was agreed to by the Commission of Fine Arts, with the suggestion to substitute low planting possibly at the ellipses.

Major Kehaffey also called attention to the plan considered at the March meeting of the Commission, with reference to the balustrade at the Lincoln Memorial Plaza, in relation to the parapet of the Memorial Bridge. Mr. Parsons suggested adopting solid masonry leading from the bridge to the balustrade. The Commission asked Mr. Vitale to bring this matter to the attention of Mr. Kendall. (Exhibit F).

8. **MEADE MEMORIAL:** Mr. Julian Millard, Executive Officer of the Pennsylvania State Art Commission, Harrisburg, Pa., appeared before the Commission for advice on the question of substituting a stone wreath in Tennessee marble for the bronze wreath on the Meade Memorial, which he said was causing discoloration. Mr. Moore said the matter had been brought to the attention of the Commission by Colonel Grant in the following letter:

April 3, 1929.

"The following letter has just been received from Mr. Julian Millard, Administrative Officer, State Art Commission, State of Pennsylvania:

I was very much disturbed, on my recent visit to Washington, to find that the bronze work on the Meade Memorial is already causing serious staining and unsightly condition at the base-mold of the pedestal.

I have consulted a number of people as to the cure and prevention of such a condition, and learned that there is only one way to prevent further damage. The bronze must be replaced by Tennessee marble. We have money remaining and I am recommending that this be done.

The question arises as to whether the Fine Arts Commission must be consulted in this matter. Will you kindly give me your opinion on this?"

Please advise me at your early convenience whether you are prepared to act on this matter yourself, or whether it will be necessary to hold it over until the next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts."

cross was recommended, and this was referred to the Commission of
the Arts, with the suggestion to substitute low standing crosses as
the symbols.

attention of the Council. (Exhibit 7)

the attention of the Committee by Colonel Hunt in the following letter:

1934
The following letter was just received from
Mr. William Millard, Administrative Officer, State Art Commission,
State of Pennsylvania:
I am very much disturbed, on my recent visit to
Washington, to find that the progress work on the Medal
has been almost entirely suspended and that the
position of the Medal is in a very critical
position. I have contacted a number of people as to the
cause and prevention of such a condition, and learned
that there is only one way to prevent further damage. The
progress must be replaced by Tennessee people. We have money
remaining and I am recommending that this be done.
The question arises as to whether or not the State
Commission must be organized in this matter. Will you
kindly give me your opinion on this?

Please advise me at your earliest convenience whether you are prepared to act on this matter yourself, or whether it will be necessary to hold it over until the next meeting of the Commission of the State.

Mr. Moore replied to this letter on April 10th, as follows:

"Replying to your letter of April 9 on the subject of the replacement of the bronze work with Tennessee marble on the Meade Memorial, I would say the Commission of Fine Arts would approve such replacement, provided it shall be done by Mr. Charles Grafly, the sculptor of the monument. Of course it would be highly improper for any other than the sculptor to do this work, for the bronze is an essential feature of the composition. I understand that Mr. Grafly himself approves this suggested change."

Mr. Millard said he had planned to have Mr. Grafly carry out this work, but about a week ago he was seriously injured in an automobile accident, and it would be months, if ever, before he would be able to do the work. The Commission were very sorry to hear this. Mr. Moore said he had been talking with Mr. Fraser about the matter, who had recommended that Piccirilli Brothers use the old model for the bronze eagle and wreath to make the stone wreath, but that special attention must be given to the eagle.

The Commission inspected the Meade Memorial in the afternoon, in company with Mr. Millard, and it was concluded that the main trouble of the discoloration was caused by dirt and soot, and that the Memorial needed especially "pointing up". A report embodying the recommendations of the Commission was sent to Mr. Millard (Exhibit G).

9. HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING FOR SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK: Plans were submitted by Mr. Frank M. Lanagan, City Engineer, of Schenectady, New York, for a proposed High School building in that city, with letter as follows:

April 12, 1929.

Preliminary plans have been submitted for a new high school for the City of Schenectady and we are anxious that the proportions and design of the elevations should conform to the best architectural practice.

Mr. Benjamin Wistar Morris, Architect, of New York, with whom I discussed this matter suggested that if I should submit the preliminary drawings to the National Commission of Fine Arts, he believed the Commission would be willing to examine the plans for any

Mr. Moore replied to this letter on April 10th, as follows:

"Replying to your letter of April 7th and the enclosed of the agreement of the bronze with the Committee on the Medal, I would say that the Committee of this year would have been very pleased, if it had been possible, to have Mr. Charles Smith, the designer of the medal, of course, it would be highly improper for me to alter the sculpture to do this work, for the bronze is an essential feature of the composition. I understand that Mr. Smith himself approved this suggested change."

Mr. Willard said he was pleased to have Mr. Smith say this

work, but about a week ago he was seriously injured in an automobile accident, and it would be months, if not years, before he would be able to do the work. The Committee were very sorry to hear this. Mr. Moore said he had been talking with Mr. Smith about the medal, and had recommended that the Committee use the old model for the bronze eagle and wreath to save the time and cost, but that special attention must be given to the eagle.

The Committee inspected the medal submitted in the afternoon, in company with Mr. Willard, and it was concluded that the main principle of the design was correct, and that the memorial needed especially "pointing up". A report embodying the recommendations of the

Committee was sent to Mr. Willard (Exhibit B).

2. NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, N. Y. Plans were submitted by Mr. Frank E. Lammiman, City Engineer, of Rochester, New York, for a

proposed high school building in that city, with letter as follows:

"I am pleased to hear that the plans for the new high school building in Rochester, New York, submitted by me on April 12, 1929,

for the City of Rochester, and we are anxious that the proportions and design of the building should conform to the best architectural practice."

Mr. Benjamin Edgar Morris, President, of New York, with whom I discussed this matter suggested that it is almost certain the preliminary drawing to the proposed building of this type, he believed the Commission would be willing to consider the plans for any

defects in proportions and design and suggest changes to overcome them. Acting on this suggestion I am transmitting herewith the full set of preliminary drawings and descriptions in the hope that the Commission will give the City of Schenectady the benefit of its advice in the matter.

Trusting that I may not be presuming too much on the good nature of your Commission, I beg to remain,"

Mr. Morris said he had not seen the plans but felt when the matter was brought to his attention that the Commission might be interested to see them, since plans for Washington school buildings are continually receiving the attention of the Commission.

The Commission inspected the plans and were well pleased with them. The design in general both as to balance of plan and detail of the architecture was considered very good. Mr. Lanagan was informed accordingly of the suggestions of the Commission made as to the plans (Exhibit H).

10. **SOLDIERS MEDAL:** By letter dated March 27, 1929, Hon. James W. Good, Secretary of War, submitted models for the proposed Soldiers Medal, as follows:

"In accordance with the terms of Executive Order No. 3524, of July 28, 1921, I am sending you herewith three plaster models made by Mr. Joseph Anthony Atchison; three plaster models made by Mr. E. K. Bush-Brown (different from those heretofore submitted by him), and the three plaster models originally prepared in the Office of The Quartermaster General of the Army, for use in connection with the adoption of a design for the Soldier's Medal authorized by the Act of Congress approved July 2, 1926 (Public No. 446, 69th Congress). A letter from Mr. Atchison dated January 28, 1929, is also enclosed.

It is requested that the inclosed letter and plaster models be returned to this Department with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to the merits of the proposed designs."

The matter had been referred to Mr. Weinman, who had inspected the models (through photographs of them), and made recommendations which were embodied in a letter to the Secretary of War. This was read by the Chairman and endorsed by the Commission, disapproving the models (Exhibit I).

11. **PUBLIC SERVICE STATION,** Mr. Moore brought to the attention of the Commission a print of a proposed Public Service Station, which is to be built

defects in proportions and design and suggest changes to overcome them. Acting on this suggestion I am transmitting herewith the full set of preliminary drawings and specifications in the hope that the Commission will give the design the benefit of its advice in the matter.

Trusting that I may not be troubling you need on the subject of your opinion, I am to remain,

Mr. Morris said he had not seen the plans yet but that the matter was brought to his attention that the Commission might be interested in the plans for Washington school buildings and considering the attention of the Commission.

The Commission inspected the plans and were well pleased with them. The design in general both as to balance of plan and detail of the architectural was considered very good. Mr. Langdon was interested especially in the suggestions of the Commission made as to the plans (Exhibit I).

10. **WORKING MODEL.** By letter dated March 27, 1911, Mr. James H. Wood, Secretary of War, submitted models for the proposed building to the following:

"In accordance with the terms of Executive Order No. 8321, of July 21, 1911, I am sending you herewith three plaster models made by Mr. Joseph Anthony Johnson; three plaster models made by Mr. E. E. Shaw-Brann (different from those submitted by him), and the three plaster models originally prepared in the Office of the Architect General of the Army. You are in communication with the Architect of the Capitol for the Capitol's Board and advised by the Act of Congress approved July 2, 1905 (Public No. 265, 35th Congress). A letter from Mr. Anderson dated January 20, 1911, is also enclosed. It is requested that the models be placed in the hands of the Commission of the Capitol with the views of the proposed design."

The matter had been referred to Mr. Williams, who had inspected the models (through photographs of same), and made recommendations which were embodied in a letter to the Secretary of War. This was read by the Chairman and endorsed by the Commission, approving the models (Exhibit I).

11. **WHITE MARBLE DESIGN.** Mr. Moore brought to the attention of the Commission a print of a proposed White Service Station, which is to be built

near Alexandria, and will be along the main line of the Mount Vernon Boulevard. The design called for an ordinary office building. Mr. Moore said he felt new buildings along the Mount Vernon Boulevard should be in keeping with the historic character of the route---buildings of colonial or the Georgian type. The Commission heartily concurred in this.

12. CONNECTICUT AVENUE BRIDGE, Hand Rail: Under date of March 28, 1929, Mr. C. R. Whyte, Engineer of Bridges of the District of Columbia, submitted a suggested design for a new handrail on the Connecticut Avenue Bridge, with letter as follows:

"At the request of Capt. Whitehurst, Assistant Engineer Commissioner, I am sending you herewith a study for treatment of the handrail of the Connecticut Avenue Bridge.

This study is developed with two points in mind, first the urgent necessity for strengthening this rail, and second a railing to be consistent with type to be used on the proposed future Calvert Street Bridge. The rail is designed to permit of construction in two parts, if necessary from the appropriation standpoint, i.e., the base to be built first around the existing iron rail. As money is available the balusters and top rail would be placed, as a unit of course, utilizing and encasing as much of the existing rail as practicable.

We would be glad to have your criticism of this project from the esthetic standpoint. The finish of the new work would be identical with the concrete portions of the existing parapet.

The design was submitted to Mr. Morris, for consideration by him and Mr. Cross, who called for a more detailed design; and action in the matter was deferred until the ^{next} meeting of the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission in company with Mr. Whyte visited the Connecticut Avenue Bridge in the afternoon, where the project was considered.

The idea of pouring concrete at the base of the existing handrail did not commend itself to the Commission, and as far as the Calvert Street Bridge is concerned, the Commission felt that any question of handrail in connection with

near Alexandria, and will be along the main line of the future system connecting
the design called for an ordinary office building. Mr. Brown said he told
new buildings along the future system should be in keeping with the
historic character of the route--buildings of colonial or the Georgian type.
The Commission tentatively concurred in this.
Mr. Brown said he told the Commission that the future system should be in keeping with the
historic character of the route--buildings of colonial or the Georgian type.
The Commission tentatively concurred in this.
Mr. Brown said he told the Commission that the future system should be in keeping with the
historic character of the route--buildings of colonial or the Georgian type.
The Commission tentatively concurred in this.

At the request of Mr. Brown, the Commission, I am sending you herewith a copy of the report of
the Board of Engineers, dated January 10, 1907.
This study is developed with two points in mind, first the
urgent necessity for strengthening this wall and second a building
to be consistent with type to be used on the proposed future
railway system. The wall is located in front of the existing
in the wall, it is necessary to have the appropriate equipment, i.e., the
base to be built first around the existing iron wall. As money is
available the balustrade and top rail would be placed, as a unit of
costs, differing and costing as much of the existing wall as
practicable.
We would be glad to have your criticism of this project from
the public and the Commission. The plan of the wall and the
identical with the concrete portion of the existing wall.

The design was submitted to Mr. Brown, for consideration by him and
Mr. Brown, who called for a more detailed design; and action in the matter was
deferred until the meeting of the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission in
company with Mr. Brown visited the Washington Avenue Bridge in the afternoon,
where the project was considered.
The idea of putting concrete at the base of the existing wall and the
concrete itself to the Commission, and as far as the existing street bridge is
concerned, the Commission felt that any question of walling in connection with

the proposed Calvert Street Bridge could be taken up separately at a future time.

Mr. Moore was of the opinion that an additional handrail at the curb of the Connecticut Avenue Bridge would spoil the appearance of the bridge, and in his opinion was not necessary, as it is impossible to guard against all accidents and those who are determined to do harm to themselves.

After consideration, the Commission recommended concrete posts and chain at the edge of the sidewalk. These are to be similar to those used at the Arlington Amphitheater, to protect the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Also, the Commission recommended that a scale drawing be submitted, using balusters in proper relation to the bridge itself, for consideration at the next meeting. (Exhibit J).

The Commission had as their guests at luncheon Major Mehaffey, Mr. Willard, Mr. Parsons, and Mr. Brinckerhoff. After luncheon the Commission inspected the model for the Triangle development, at the United States Chamber of Commerce, where arrangements were being made to exhibit it in connection with the new plans for the development of the National Capital, including plans for the Enlargement of the Capitol Grounds and the development of Union Station Plaza, the 1901 plan for the Mall, the Municipal Center, and the suggested treatment of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue. The Commission were much impressed by the model for the Triangle, which is 22 feet long and 9 feet wide at the base (Commerce Building, along Fifteenth Street), and was designed for a uniform treatment of the new public buildings south of Pennsylvania Avenue, from the Capitol to the Treasury Department, a distance of one mile. It seemed to the Commission certain improvements could be made in the model, which will be considered at a future meeting.

In the evening the Commission were the guests of Hon. Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the meeting on the Public Buildings Program, at the United States Chamber of Commerce, which was also attended by many delegates of the American Institute of Architects, who were attending the annual convention in Washington. The speakers of the evening were the President of the United States Herbert Hoover, Senator Smoot and Representative Elliott, in charge of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committees of Congress, and Mr. Milton B. Medary, on "Making a Capital City". Afterwards, The City of Washington was shown in Moving Picture.

The Commission adjourned, to meet Tuesday, May 28th.

REGULATING THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8746) to regulate the height and exterior design and construction of public and private buildings in the National Capital fronting on or located within 200 feet of a public building or public park.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, what is meant by the language?—

Any portion of which is to front or abut upon the grounds of the Capitol, the grounds of the White House, the portion of Pennsylvania Avenue extending from the Capitol to the White House, Rock Creek Park—

And so forth. How far from the White House would this be applicable?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. There is no land abutting there—H Street abuts Lafayette Square.

Mr. SCHAFER. Reserving the right to object—and I believe I shall object—I want to ask the gentleman a question. Section 2 states that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall prepare plats defining the areas within which application for building permits shall be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for its recommendation. Does not the gentleman think it would be a better policy if the plats were prepared so that Congress would know what plats were included before passing the legislation?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I call the gentleman's attention to section 1, which defines the area. It is then proposed that the plats shall be prepared in order that they may show what areas are affected by the public interest. I consider this one of the most important, necessary, and meritorious bills that has come before the House to-day. The Government has expended and is expending millions of dollars on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue and on the grounds of the Capitol and the White House, and this is to prevent private capital from erecting undesirable buildings.

Mr. SCHAFER. It will only apply to Pennsylvania Avenue and the grounds abutting the Capitol and the White House?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The White House and Rock Creek Park.

Mr. SCHAFER. No danger of its being applied to the small parks in the District?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in accordance with the provision of paragraph 17 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, that Congress shall have power to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district" as may become the seat of government of the United States; and in keeping with the spirit of the laws, agreements, and acts establishing the National Capital, at which time the original owners formally agreed, "in consideration of the great benefits expected," upon conveyance to trustees appointed by the President of "all lands he might think proper to include within the Federal City," with "the sole power of laying off said city in what manner he pleased and to retain any manner of squares he might think proper for public use," and that the conveyance of lots to any purchasers should be "on such conditions as thought reasonable by the President for regulating the materials and manner of the buildings and improvements generally in the said city, or in particular streets or parts thereof for convenience, safety, and order"; and in consideration of the special benefits inuring to the owners of adjacent property by the construction of public buildings and by the establishment of parks and reservations of such character and such surroundings as befit the dignity of the buildings and public grounds of this Nation's Capital; hereafter no permit shall be granted for the erection or alteration of any building within the District of Columbia, any portion of which is to front upon or to be located within 200 feet of any public building or any public park, parkway, or reservation, except space for street parking, until the plans therefor, so far as they relate to height and appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction have been submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts and approved by that commission as involving no reasonably avoidable impairment of the public values dependent upon said public building or public park, parkway, or reservation, and the erection or alteration of any building so located shall conform to the plans so approved; in case of any change in the application for permit or accompanying plans the application shall be treated as a new case, and as such shall be subject

to all the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That if the Commission of Fine Arts fails to report its approval or disapproval of any such plans to the inspector of buildings of the District of Columbia within 30 days of the submission of said plans to the commission, its approval thereof shall be assumed and a permit may be issued: *Provided further*, That the Commission of Fine Arts may, from time to time, designate certain classes of cases, such as those of proposed building sites fronting upon or located within 200 feet of certain minor public buildings, parks, parkways, or reservations, or applications for permits for certain classes of relatively temporary or otherwise unimportant buildings, in respect to which the requirements of this act, in the opinion of said commission, may reasonably be waived for the time being without prejudice to the public interests; and as to such classes, approval of plans by the Commission of Fine Arts shall not be a prerequisite to the issuance of building permits.

SEC. 2. Said Commission of Fine Arts, as early as practicable after approval of this act, shall prepare plats defining the areas within which application for building permits shall be submitted for its approval, and issue suitable explanations for the information and guidance of prospective builders in preparing applications for building permits within said areas.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That in view of the provisions of the Constitution respecting the establishment of the seat of the National Government, the duties it imposed upon Congress in connection therewith, and the solicitude shown and the efforts exerted by President Washington in the planning and development of the Capital City, it is hereby declared: That such development should proceed along the lines of good order, good taste, and with due regard to the public interests involved, and a reasonable degree of control should be exercised over the architecture of private or semipublic buildings adjacent to public buildings and grounds of major importance. To this end, hereafter when application is made for permit for the erection or alteration of any building, any portion of which is to front or abut upon the grounds of the Capitol, the grounds of the White House, the portion of Pennsylvania Avenue extending from the Capitol to the White House, Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, Potomac Park, the Mall, or abutting upon any street bordering any of said grounds or parks, the plans therefor, so far as they relate to height and appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction, shall be submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the Commission of Fine Arts; and the said commission shall report promptly to said commissioners its recommendations, including such changes, if any, as in its judgment are necessary to prevent reasonably avoidable impairment

of the public values belonging to such public building or park; and said commissioners shall take such action as shall, in their judgment, effect reasonable compliance with such recommendations: *Provided*, That if the said Commission of Fine Arts fails to report its approval or disapproval of such plans within 30 days, its approval thereof shall be assumed and a permit may be issued.

"SEC. 2. Said Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in consultation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, as early as practicable after approval of this act, shall prepare plats defining the areas within which appliances for building permits shall be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for its recommendations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

Exhibit A

ec

171
121

COPY

April 26, 1929.

Dear Dr. Johnson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday, approved the design submitted by you and Dr. Scott for a Women's Dormitory, at Howard University. A few minor suggestions were made to your architect. It is understood that this is to be the first unit of a group of buildings, for which Congress has provided an appropriation.

The Commission also approved the general plan submitted for the lay-out of the grounds. It is understood that details of the plan as affecting the Highway Plan of the District of Columbia, including a square or circle at the head of Vermont Avenue, are being taken up with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, President,

Howard University,

Washington, D.C.

The Commission were much pleased with the way in which the plans were presented by your architect.

Exhibit B

April 28, 1933.

Dear Dr. Johnson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday, approved the design submitted by you and Mr. Scott for a women's dormitory, at Howard University. A few minor suggestions were made to your architect. It is understood that this is to be the first sale of a group of buildings, for which Congress has provided an appropriation.

The Commission also approved the general plan submitted for the layout of the grounds. It is understood that details of the plan as affecting the Highway Plan of the District of Columbia, including a square or circle at the head of Vermont Avenue, are being taken up with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Dr. Theodore W. Johnson, President,

Howard University,

Washington, D.C.

The Commission were much pleased with the way in which the plans were presented by your architect.

Respectfully

[PUBLIC RESOLUTION—No. 51—70TH CONGRESS]

[S. J. Res. 23]

Joint Resolution Providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration in 1929 and 1930 of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the conquest of the Northwest Territory by General George Rogers Clark and his army, and authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a permanent memorial of the Revolutionary War in the West, and of the accession of the Old Northwest to the United States on the site of Fort Sackville, which was captured by George Rogers Clark and his men February 25, 1779.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission) and to be composed of fifteen commissioners, as follows: Three persons to be appointed by the President of the United States; three Senators by the President of the Senate; three Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and six members of the George Rogers Clark Memorial Commission of Indiana to be selected by such commission.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000 to be expended by the commission in cooperation with the George Rogers Clark Memorial Commission of Indiana, the county of Knox, Indiana, the city of Vincennes, Indiana, and such other agencies, public or private, as the commission may determine, for the purpose of designing and constructing at or near the site of Fort Sackville in the city of Vincennes, Indiana, a permanent memorial, commemorating the winning of the Old Northwest and the achievements of George Rogers Clark and his associates in the war of the American Revolution: *Provided*, That the State of Indiana shall furnish the site for such memorial and that full, complete, and absolute title to the land shall be vested in the State of Indiana, free and clear of all liens and encumbrances, and that the State of Indiana shall assume, without expense to the Federal Government, the perpetual care and maintenance of said site and the memorial constructed thereon, after such memorial shall have been constructed.

SEC. 3. The commission may in its discretion accept from any source, public or private, sums of money to be added to the amount herein authorized to be appropriated for said memorial, or gifts for its embellishment.

SEC. 4. All expenditures of the commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman of the commission, but no expenditure shall be made or authorized by the commission except with the approval of a majority of the commissioners.

SEC. 5. The United States shall not be held liable for any obligation or indebtedness incurred by the State of Indiana, the George Rogers Clark Memorial Commission of Indiana, the county of Knox,

Indiana, the city of Vincennes, Indiana, or any other agency or officer, employee or agent thereof, for any purpose for which the commission may under the provisions of this resolution make expenditures.

SEC. 6. Before any of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be expended, the plans and designs of the said memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 7. No fee or charge of any character shall be imposed or made for admission to the said memorial or the grounds on which it may stand after the memorial shall have been completed and accepted by the commission.

SEC. 8. The commission shall cease and terminate June 30, 1931.

Approved, May 23, 1928.

Exhibit C

COPY

April 26, 1929.

Dear Senator Fess:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on April 25, 1929, approved the general plans for the George Rogers Clark Memorial, to be erected at Vincennes, Indiana, prepared and submitted by Bennett, Parsons and Frost, of Chicago, Illinois. The Commission were in conference with Mr. William B. Parsons, Consultant, with regard to the project.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Hon. Simeon D. Fess, Chairman,
George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial
Commission, United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Exhibit D

UNITED STATES SENATE
Committee on the Library. April 27, 1929

My dear Mr. Moore:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 26th conveying the approval by the Fine Arts Commission of the general plans for the George Rogers Clark Memorial to be erected at Vincennes, prepared and submitted by Bennett, Parsons and Frost, of Chicago.

Thanking you for this action, I am,

Yours very truly,

Simeon D. Fess

Hon. Charles Moore,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit D-1

your name and any other agency
which you are now or have been
connected with, and the name of
the person or persons to whom you
are now or have been connected.

April 26, 1933.

Dear Senator Rogers:
The Commission of Fine Arts,
organized by the National Academy of Design,
has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st inst.,
concerning the proposed erection of a memorial to George Rogers Clark.

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on April 25,

1933, approved the proposal for the erection of a memorial to George Rogers Clark.

to be erected at Vincennes, Indiana, prepared and submitted by
Bennett, Parsons and Frost, of Chicago, Illinois. The Commission
were in conference with Mr. William E. Parsons, Consultant, with

regard to the project.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully,
Hon. Charles Moore, Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Enclosed

UNITED STATES SENATE
Committee on the Library. April 27, 1933

My dear Mr. Moore:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 26th conveying the
approval by the Fine Arts Commission of the general plans for the
George Rogers Clark Memorial to be erected at Vincennes, prepared and
submitted by Bennett, Parsons and Frost, of Chicago.

Thanking you for this action, I am,

Yours very truly,

Hon. Charles Moore,
Committee on Fine Arts,
Washington, D.C.

Enclosed - 1

COPY

May 2, 1929.

Dear General Cheatham:

After the visit of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts to the Arlington National Cemetery, and a consideration of the tentative plans for roads connecting the end of the Memorial Bridge with the Arlington Mansion and the Amphitheater, the Commission were unanimous in their opinion that it is absolutely necessary that a study be made of the Arlington National Cemetery with a view to retaining certain areas for the sake of preserving the sacredness and dignity of the place, and also for the sake of bringing out those historic features which should have particular emphasis. The Commission are strengthened in this opinion by a restudy of the plans designed by Mr. George Gibbs, formerly of the Quartermaster General's Office, with the cooperation of Mr. James L. Greenleaf, a former landscape architect member of the Commission of Fine Arts. These two gentlemen spent weeks of time on this subject, and their studies have been the basis of the recommendations made by the Commission in regard to the treatment of the grounds about the Mansion.

The members of the Commission were satisfied that by a little rearrangement the existing roads can be utilized to a greater extent than is shown on the tentative plan submitted to the Commission. The necessity of a comprehensive plan is emphasized by the attempt to relate the landscape in connection with the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier to the remainder of the cemetery. The Amphitheater itself was a piece of formality set down in an informal landscape, and there has always been a necessity to relate this dominating feature to the cemetery as a whole. It is all these considerations taken together that leads the Commission to recommend to you either the direct employment of Mr. Arthur W. Brinckerhoff, Landscape Architect (whose address is No. 161 Park Avenue, New York City), or if more convenient the purchase from him of a plan of Arlington National Cemetery to be made after intensive study on the ground.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major General B. F. Cheatham,
The Quartermaster General,
United States Army,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit E

May 2, 1915.

Dear General Chestnut:

After the visit of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts to the Arlington National Cemetery, and a consideration of the tentative plans for some connection between the Arlington National Cemetery and the Arlington National Cemetery, the Commission were unanimous in their opinion that it is absolutely necessary that a study be made of the Arlington National Cemetery with a view to retaining certain areas for the same of preserving the sacredness and dignity of the place, and also for the same of bringing out those historic features which should have artistic emphasis. This Commission are convinced in this opinion by a study of the plans designed by Mr. George Gibbs, formerly of the Department of the Interior, with the cooperation of Mr. James E. Greenleaf, a former landscape architect member of the Commission of Fine Arts. These two gentlemen spent weeks of time on this subject, and their studies have been the basis of the recommendations made by the Commission in regard to the treatment of the grounds around the Mansion.

The members of the Commission were convinced that by a little rearrangement the existing grounds can be utilized to a greater extent than is shown on the tentative plan submitted to the Commission. The necessity of a comprehensive plan is emphasized by the attempt to relate the landscape in connection with the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier to the remainder of the cemetery. The Architect itself was a piece of formality set down in an informal landscape, and there has always been a necessity to relate this dominating feature to the cemetery as a whole. It is all these considerations taken together that leads the Commission to recommend to you either the direct employment of Mr. Arthur F. Brinckerhoff, Landscape Architect (whose address is No. 101 West Avenue, New York City), or if more convenient the purchase from him of a plan of Arlington National Cemetery to be made after intensive study on the grounds.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully,

Charles Moore,

Exhibit B

Major General J. V. Johnston,
The Quartermaster General,
United States Army,
Washington, D.C.

COPY

May 2, 1929.

Dear Mr. Cramton:

When the Arlington Amphitheater was built a new note was added to Arlington National Cemetery. The importance of the Arlington Mansion was divided and a new center of interest was created. The Amphitheater, being formal in character, required certain formality in its treatment, but it never was related to the whole cemetery and it has always been so unrelated as to seem an intrusion. Mr. Luce felt this very strongly and so expressed it in an informal conference with the members of the Commission of Fine Arts. It was he who openly suggested what the Commission had already discussed, namely that the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier requires a flight of steps to give it dignity. The Commission feel very strongly that it will be a direct saving of money as well as an artistic necessity to have a plan made for Arlington at the earliest possible moment. The tentative plans submitted to the Commission seem not to recognize existing conditions that might be taken advantage of; while at the same time they were not related to any general plans and were simply a means of getting from one point to another without much reference to the topographic features. I enclose a copy of a letter sent to General Sheatham on this subject, because I know how deep your interest is in it.

Cordially yours,

Hon. Louis C. Cramton,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Charles Moore

Exhibit E-1

When the following information is supplied to you:

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

divided and a new column of interest was created. The Amphitheater, being

total is estimated, no other details are given, but it is treatment at all times, and is in fact

cover are limited to 100,000 copies and 100,000 copies.

as to some individuals. Mr. Ince told this story in the following manner:

It is recommended that the following information be included in the report:

[illegible]

of which to 30,000 a series of vertical marks was to show the fall view.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

...a direct saving of money as well as a

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED EXCEPT WHERE SHOWN OTHERWISE

2000 年 12 月 20 日 星期三 12:00:00

was not willing to make a plan to show his wife's letters as he had

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to determine the nature of the problem. This involves a thorough understanding of the situation and the factors that are contributing to the problem. Once the nature of the problem is understood, the next step is to identify the causes of the problem. This involves a detailed analysis of the situation and the factors that are contributing to the problem. Once the causes of the problem are identified, the next step is to develop a plan of action. This involves determining the steps that need to be taken to solve the problem. Once a plan of action is developed, the next step is to implement the plan. This involves carrying out the steps that have been determined in the plan of action. Finally, the last step in the process is to evaluate the results of the plan. This involves determining whether the plan has been successful in solving the problem and whether any further action is needed.

Received 12 April 2011; accepted 12 July 2011; first published online 12 September 2011

T I want you to know that

1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 26

STOPI BEZVEDEN

Washington, D.C.
House of Representatives
Hon. Louis C. Crampton

I-55 510145

COPY

April 30, 1929.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on April 25, 1929, considered a General Plan (dated April 18, 1929) for the treatment of connecting roadways with the Arlington Memorial Bridge, prepared by McKim, Mead and White, Architects, and submitted by Major Mehaffey. The Commission approved the plan, with the suggestion that the temples proposed at the ends of the cross arms on Columbia Island be considered as merely suggestive. Subject to further study, this Commission favor a low planting scheme for the circles.

Further consideration was given to the balustrade at the Lincoln Memorial Plaza, and its relations with the parapet of the Arlington Memorial Bridge. Mr. Vitale has been asked to confer with Mr. Kendall regarding this matter.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit F

April 26, 1929.

Dear Mr. Millard:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday, learned with much regret of the recent accident of Mr. Charles Grafly, sculptor of the Meade Memorial, so as to make it impossible for him, as it seems, to undertake the task of substituting stone for the gilded wreath over the head of General Meade.

During an inspection of the Memorial with you, the Commission noted certain discoloration, some of which is doubtless due to drippings from the wreath, but much of it is caused by soot and rain. Therefore the staining complained of would not be stopped by changing the wreath. The statue should have ordinary care and an occasional simple cleaning. But the patina caused by the natural action of the weather gives added beauty to the Memorial. The Commission feel that gilding the wreath carefully in places where the gilt has become weak and a treatment with lacquer will be sufficient. However, if you wish to pursue this matter further, the Commission suggest you consult Piccirilli Brothers, of New York City. If it be insisted upon that the wreath is to be put into stone, it is a question whether the model used for the bronze wreath could be used without redesigning the eagle.

The Commission noted that the Memorial needs "pointing up", and recommend that this be done as soon as possible.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Julian Millard, Administrative Officer,

Pennsylvania Art Commission,

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Exhibit G

April 26, 1929.

Dear Mr. Millard:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday, learned with much regret of the recent accident to Mr. Charles Doolittle Walcott of the Senate Memorial, so as to make it impossible for him, as it seems, to undertake the task of superintending stone for the killed wreath over the head of General Meade.

During an inspection of the Memorial with you, the Commission noted certain discoloration, some of which is doubtless due to leaching from the wreath, but much of it is caused by soot and rain. Therefore the staining complained of would not be stopped by changing the wreath. The statue should have ordinary care and an occasional slight cleaning. But the staining caused by the natural action of the weather gives reason to the Memorial. The Commission feel that giving the wreath carefully in places where the gilt has become weak and a treatment with lacquer will be sufficient. However, if you wish to remove this matter further, the Commission suggest you consult the Architectural Division, of New York City. It is to be insisted that the wreath is to be put into stone, it is a question whether the model used for the bronze wreath could be used without regaining the eagle.

The Commission noted that the Memorial needs "pointing up," and recommend that this be done as soon as possible.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. John Millard, Administrative Officer,

Pennsylvania Art Commission,

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

COPY

April 26, 1929.

Dear Mr. Ianagan:

The plans which you submitted for a new high school for the City of Schenectady, with your letter of April 12th, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting yesterday.

The design in general, both as to balance of plan and composition, and also detail of the architecture, is considered very good. The Commission offer the following suggestions:

Where the windows are doubled, if they could be treated as separate windows the effect would be better. The use of a keystone over a central mullion in a double treatment like this is difficult and very unsatisfactory. Where there are three double windows, as indicated in the design, it would seem the same amount of light could be secured with four or five single windows. In the central feature, if the three windows, over the main entrance, could be treated more as repeated windows with some architectural accent over the central window, it would improve the design; there would be apparently sufficient light and the seeming excess of the importance of the second story window would be reduced. The Commission realize the difficulty in providing the amount of daylight required by law in the changes suggested.

It is thought the cupola, with its octagon form, is a little too small; that the base would be improved by increasing its height. As it is it appears sunk into the roof. It is also suggested that the treatment of the chimneys be simplified as there is hardly sufficient wall surface to accommodate the amount of detailed treatment indicated.

A better result might be produced by a little further study of the relationship between the arched door opening and the pedimented door opening at the end of the lateral corridors and serving the auditorium, and in corresponding location on the opposite side of the building.

The plans are herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Frank A. Ianagan, City Engineer,
Department of Public Works,
Schenectady, New York.

Exhibit H

April 23, 1911

Dear Mr. Langdon:

The plans which you submitted for a new high school for the City of Schenectady, with your letter of April 12th, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting yesterday.

The design in general, both as to balance of plan and composition, and also detail of the architecture, is considered very good. The Commission offers the following suggestions:

Where the windows are double, it may be better to treat them as separate windows the effect would be better. The use of a keystone over a central window in a double treatment like this is difficult and very unsatisfactory. Where there are three double windows, as indicated in the design, it would seem the same amount of light could be secured with four or five single windows. In the central feature, if the three windows, over the main entrance, could be treated more as repeated windows with some architectural accent over the central window, it would improve the design; there would be apparently sufficient light and the seeming excess of the importance of the second story window would be reduced. The Commission realizes the difficulty in providing the amount of daylight required by law in the changes suggested.

It is thought the cypole, with its octagon form, is a little too small; that the base would be improved by increasing the height. As it is it appears sunk into the foot. It is also suggested that the treatment of the chimney be simplified as there is hardly sufficient wall surface to accommodate the amount of detailed treatment indicated.

A better result might be produced by a little further study of the relationship between the ground floor opening and the vestibule door opening at the end of the lateral corridor and serving the auditorium, and in corresponding location on the opposite side of the building.

The plans are herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

ST. JOHN L. LANGDON, 212 DECATUR,
Department of Public Works,
Schenectady, New York.

COPY

April 29, 1929.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The models for the Soldier's Medal, authorized by the Act of Congress, approved July 2, 1926, which you submitted with your letter of March 27th, were brought to the particular attention of the sculptor member of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission respectfully report as follows:

The models made by Mr. Bush-Brown are weak in the principal device, the eagle and shield, and are lacking in originality. An eagle other than that used on Government seals would be decidedly preferable and give greater distinction to the medal. The space for the name of the recipient seems inadequate and the placing too casual. The design for the obverse, kneeling woman with shield, is poorly spaced and is not a well balanced design. The bar also is weak in design.

The design of the Quartermaster General's Office would be much improved if the wings were spread sideways, partly folded and brought entirely within the circle. The same would apply to the flames of torches on the reverse. It being assumed that the name of the recipient is to be placed on the ribbon between the torches ~~and~~ it would seem better to have all the inscription, aside from the name, on the reverse.

The third design, by Mr. Atchison, makes an attempt at novelty, ~~in~~ but its shape is in poor taste from a medallion point of view and its symbolism is too involved.

The Commission have given a great deal of attention to the subject of medals and have been trying to bring about a radical change so that when the United States gives a medal for distinguished service the medal itself should correspond to the service commemorated.

Designing a medal is an art in itself. The Commission suggest that you secure the services of one of perhaps a dozen medallists in this country who are capable of producing a work of art. This Commission understood from a letter received from the Chief of Staff, dated April 20, 1928, a copy of which is enclosed, that such procedure would be taken. The Commission of Fine Arts will be pleased to cooperate in the work, so that a medal will be produced worthy as an award by the United States Government.

All models submitted are disapproved. They are returned to you herewith, together with a copy of Mr. Atchison's letter.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Honorable James W. Good,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit I

April 29, 1928

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The models for the Soldier's Medal, authorized by the Act of Congress, approved July 2, 1926, which you submitted with your letter of March 27th, were brought to the particular attention of the sculptor member of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission respectfully report as follows:

The models made by Mr. Bush-Brown are weak in the principal device, the eagle and shield, and are lacking in originality. An eagle other than that used on Government seals would be decidedly preferable and give greater distinction to the medal. The space for the name of the recipient seems inadequate and the placing too casual. The design for the obverse, showing woman with shield, is poorly spaced and is not a well balanced design. The bar also is weak in design.

The design of the Quartermaster General's Office would be much improved if the wings were spread sideways, partly folded and brought entirely within the circle. The same would apply to the flames of torches on the reverse. It being assumed that the name of the recipient is to be placed on the ribbon between the two circles, it would seem better to have all the inscription, aside from the name, on the reverse.

The third design, by Mr. Atchison, makes an attempt at novelty, in that its shape is in poor taste from a medallion point of view and its symbolism is too involved.

The Commission have given a great deal of attention to the subject of medals and have been trying to bring about a radical change so that when the United States gives a medal for distinguished service the medal itself should correspond to the service commemorated.

Designing a medal is an art in itself. The Commission suggest that you secure the services of one of perhaps a dozen medallists in this country who are capable of producing a work of art. This Commission understood from a letter received from the Chief of Staff, dated April 20, 1928, a copy of which is enclosed, that such procedure would be taken. The Commission of Fine Arts will be pleased to cooperate in the work, so that a medal will be produced worthy as an award by the United States Government.

All models submitted are disapproved. They are returned to you herewith, together with a copy of Mr. Atchison's letter.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Honorable James W. Good,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit I

COPY

War Department
Office of the Chief of Staff
Washington

April 20, 1928.

April 20, 1928.

Dear Mr. Whyte:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday,

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman, at the Connecticut Avenue Bridge,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building, on letter of March 28th, for a stronger
Washington, D.C.

handrail on the bridge.

Dear Mr. Moore:

The Commission recommends that concrete posts and chain (similar
After further conference on the subject of the design
to those at the Arlington Amphitheater, to protect the foot of the
for the Soldier's Medal, it has been decided that the Quartermaster
Unknown Soldier be used at the end of the sidewalk. Also that a
General will request the President of the National Sculpture Society
drawing be submitted to the Commission of a handrail, drawn to scale,
to recommend to him sculptors from among whom one could be selected
using balusters in proper relation to the bridge itself. The
by the Secretary of War to make a soldier's medal.

Commission could consider this matter further with you at the next

Upon the completion of this medal, it will be submitted
meeting.

to the Fine Arts Commission for its recommendation.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Very respectfully, yours,

C. P. Summerall,

Charles Moore,
Major General,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. C. R. Whyte,
Engineer of Bridges
of the District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit J

COPY

April 26, 1929.

Dear Mr. Whyte:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday, were pleased to consider with you, at the Connecticut Avenue Bridge, the design, submitted with your letter of March 28th, for a stronger handrail on the bridge.

The Commission recommend that concrete posts and chain (similar

to those at the Arlington Amphitheater, to protect the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier) be used at the edge of the sidewalk. Also that a drawing be submitted to the Commission of a handrail, drawn to scale, using balusters in proper relation to the bridge itself. The Commission could consider this matter further with you at the next meeting.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. C. R. Whyte,
Engineer of Bridges
of the District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit 1